

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 are in the application. Claims 1-16 and 23 are allowed and claims 17-22 are rejected but would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph set forth in the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 17-22, however, to eliminate this issue, the following action is taken.

The Office Action alleges that in claim 17, line 13, the recitation “mounted on the second conduit” appears as if it should be --mounted on the first conduit--. Applicants respectfully submit that the recitation is correct. As shown in Fig. 16, the housing 130 is mounted on the conduit 18 (second conduit) slidable in end of first hollow conduit 16. The Office Action continues by alleging that the recitation in claim 17, lines 13-14 of “the one end of the first conduit” appears as if it should be --the first end of the first conduit--. Applicants have amended claim 17, lines 13-14 to recite --the first end of the first conduit--. Applicants have amended claim 17, line 14, by deleting “the second end of the prop” and inserting --away from the first end of the first conduit-- to more positively recite the patentably novel prop recited in claim 17.

The Office Action alleges that the recitation in claim 18, lines 7 of “adjacent to the end of the first conduit” appears as if it should be --adjacent to one end of the first conduit--. Applicants have amended claim 18, line 7 to recite --adjacent to one end of the first conduit--. The Office Action further alleges that the recitation in claim 18, line 17 of “mounted on the second conduit” appears as if it should be --mounted on the first conduit--. Applicants respectfully submit that the recitation in claim 18, line 17 is correct. See Fig. 16 and the discussion above regarding claim 17. Applicants have amended claim 18, line 19 by deleting “the second end of the prop” and inserting --away from the one end of the first conduit--.

The Office Action alleges that the recitation in claim 19, line 3 of “mounting external surface” appears as if it should be --mounted on the external surface--. Applicants have amended claim 19, line 3 to recite --mounted on external surface--. The term “the” is excluded from the amendment. Although Applicants acknowledge that the first conduit inherently has an “external surface”, Applicants exclude the term “the” because “external surface” was not previously introduced. Should the Examiner prefer the use of the term “the” because of inherency, Applicants would not object. The Office Action further alleges that the

recitation in claim 19, lines 7-8 of "and the external...conduit" should be deleted since it is a duplicate recitation. Applicants have deleted the recitation from claim 19, lines 7-8.

The Office Action alleges that the recitation in claim 21, line 7 of "to one end of the first conduit" appears as if it should be --to the first end of the first conduit--. Applicants have amended claim 21, line 7 to recite --to the first end of the first conduit--. The Office Action alleges that the recitation in claim 21, line 9 of "mounting external surface" appears as if it should be --mounted on the external surface--. Applicants have amended claim 21, line 9 to recite --mounted on external surface--. Applicants excluded the term "the" because "external surface" was not previously introduced. Should the Examiner prefer the use of the term "the" because of inherency, Applicants would not object. The Office Action alleges that the recitation in claim 21, line 11 of "the wedge" and in line 13 of "a wedge" is not clear. Applicants have amended claim 21 to delete reference to the "wedge" in lines 11 and 12 of claim 21 and add the deleted material to line 13.

Support for the amendments to claims 17-19 and 21 is found, among other places, in the pending claims and the drawings. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request admittance of the amendments to claims 17-19 and 21 and reconsideration of claims 17-22.

Claim 20 is dependent on claim 19 and claim 22 is dependent on claim 21. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 17-19 and 21 overcome the rejections of claims 17-22. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 17-22 and respectfully request allowance of claims 17-22.

Application No. 10/687,960  
Paper Dated: February 14, 2006  
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of January 13, 2006  
Attorney Docket No. 2202-031542

This Amendment is deemed to place the application in condition for allowance. In the event issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned before further action is taken on the case.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By 

Donald C. Lepiane  
Registration No. 25,996  
Attorney for Applicants  
700 Koppers Building  
436 Seventh Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818  
Telephone: (412) 471-8815  
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094  
E-mail: [webblaw@webblaw.com](mailto:webblaw@webblaw.com)